DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 431 863 UD 033 030

AUTHOR Lawrence, Donnie A.
TITLE Who's Minding the Children: Juvenile Violence in the United States & What School Leaders Can Do about It.
PUB DATE 1999-04-00
NOTE 31p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Quebec, Canada, April 19-23, 1999).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; Behavior Patterns; *Delinquency; Elementary Secondary Education; Instructional Leadership; Partnerships in Education; *Prevention; *School Safety; *Violence

ABSTRACT

This paper presents a theoretical and historical treatment of juvenile violence in the United States, examines some current data on juvenile violence in and out of schools, and discusses the implications for educational leadership policy decisions. Sociological and social-psychological theories have tried to explain the intensifying violent behaviors exhibited by youth in America. Although theorists advance various explanations for youth violence, it is generally recognized that community-wide approaches of collaboration and partnerships will be necessary to check the rapid rise of youth violence across the United States. A total community approach would stress prevention and intervention with followups. Some interesting initiatives around the country might provide exemplary programming for communities. Several examples are described, focusing on activities in Texas, New Mexico, and New York. When programs of this sort are established throughout the United States, the answer to "Who's minding the children?" will be "We all are." An appendix lists 53 model programs with contact information. (Contains 32 references.) (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 431 863

Who's Minding The Children: Juvenile Violence In The United States & What School Leaders Can Do About It

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Donnie Lawrence

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Donnie A. Lawrence
Assoc. Professor of Sociology & Education
Member of the Graduate Faculty
Liberty University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented To AERA

Montreal, Canada: April, 1999

ERIC Clearinghouse On Urban Education

The purpose of this paper is to present a brief, but thorough, theoretical and historical treatment of juvenile violence in the United States, look at some current data on violent juvenile crime in and out of schools and discuss what might the implications for educational leadership policy decisions be. Juvenile crime has a dramatic effect on the well being of American society and especially the youth of the United States. "Young people are disproportionately represented both as victims and as perpetrators of interpersonal violence in the United States....The Bureau of Justice reports that 37 percent of the violent crime victimizations of youths ages twelve to fifteen years occur on school property." (Allen-Hagen and Sickmund, 1993) Thus, teenagers are more likely to be the targets of crime than any other age group in America. The recent intensity of school slayings suggests that while the numbers of violent crime may have begun to level off, the intensity of what Charles Derber refers to as ***wilding*** may be increasing. (Derber, 1996)

Whether gang-oriented violence or the recent wave of individual wilding sprees, childhood and growing up in the 1990s has become a dreaded affair for students, teachers, policy makers, other school leaders, parents and all members of the community.

> Thousands of young children in America's cities are growing up amidst a worsening problem of community violence: shootings and stabbings on the street, domestic violence that spills out of households and into public view, widespread awareness of murders and serious assaults within a community, evident gang activity. In Chicago...the rate of serious assault increased 400 percent from 1974 to 1991. (Garbarino, Dubrow, Kostelny and Pardo, 1992)

Even though a great percentage of this violence is in the urban projects, the greatest percentage of war zone activity takes place: a) on the way to school, b) at school, c) on the way home from school, d) at school activities, or e) when students should have been at school.

Nothing is more jeopardizing than abusing little children. Abuse may be subtle or it may be direct and out in the open. Developmentally and environmentally, the essence of childhood is rapidly becoming the foundation of danger in America's wilding society. Young children witness crimes of violence, are eyewitnesses to shootings and stabbings and by adolescence one-third of the children in America's inner cities have obeserved homicide. (Bell, 1991) Multiple role variations have begun: victim, perpetrator, accomplice, onlooker, adult, child, peer, fantasy, repression. Many of these role variations will bring untimely deaths, maimings and incarcerations for America's children. Unfortunately:

> ...these kinds of exits are not onstage but from real life. The varying kinds of violence seen on film, TV, or the stage are deceptively simple. The victim gets up and walks away when the scene is over, but the violence occurring in the lives

UD033030

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

> of adolescents is lethal and permanent....In 1993 the National Education Association reported that on a daily basis 100,000 students carried guns to school, 160,000 missed classes for fear of physical harm, and 40 were injured or killed by firearms. In New York City the leading cause of death for adolescents is homicide. In California more kids die from gun violence than car crashes. (Sternberg, 1998)

In the 1950s and 1960s, an old-fashioned fistfight settled most interpersonal disputes and often was all that was required to determine gang territory. But in the 1990s, weapons are more likely to be utilized, grudges are held longer and wilding has brought about warlike maimings. Violence in schools:

> ...is not unique either to the public schools or to the nation's urban centers. According to the U.S. Department of Justice, public, private and nonsectarian schools have all experienced an increase in school violence. Nine percent of public, 7 percent of private and 6 percent of nonsectarian school students reported being victims of violent acts or property crimes in 1989. (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990)

Also alarming is the fact that "media reports indicate that the issue of violence in school is a national problem that has seeped into the very heartland of America. No geographic region is excluded anymore."(Futrell, 1996) "Violence In Schools," a National School Boards Association report found that out of a survey of 1,216 school administrators, 54 percent of suburban and 64 percent of urban school leaders cited more violent acts in their schools in 1993 than in 1988. (National School Boards Association, 1994)

Two other reports acknowledge the seriousness of violence in and around our schools. But the violence of weapon wilding is characteristic of a sick society. In the past 18 months children in our schools have had a substantial loss of life. But other physical and mental injuries as well as economic costs, have led to the conclusion that "the problem of violence is being brought into the school rooms around the country." (Sheley, McGee and Wright, 1992; Center to Prevent Handgun Violence, 1990) In the United States almost anyone, including convicted felons, have access to many and varied weapons. "Weapon-carrying in schools reflects easy access to weapons in the community, their presence in many homes, and the apparently widespread attitude in American society that violence is an effective way to solve problems." (Hoffman, 1996) First, estimates of fighting and weapon-carrying by children vary. The Center for Disease Control suggests that:

> ...about one-half of all high school students have been involved in a physical fight, with a much smaller proportion fighting on school property. In New York City, during the 1991-92 school year, 21 percent of all physical fights involving public high school students occurred in school, 31 percent occurred while traveling to or from schools. (CDC, 1993)

Fighting behavior may be related to weapon-carrying behavior. Often children take them to school to protect themselves from others who have already made direct threats and assaults. Jennifer Friday (1996) reports that:

> Five studies conducted from 1990 to 1993 reported that an estimated 20 to 26 percent of students had carried weapons (anywhere), whereas five surveys conducted from 1989 to 1993 reported estimates of students carrying a weapon to school ranging from 2 to 13 percent. Another survey which asked about the past year rather than the past thirty days, estimated that 22 percent of students had carried a weapon to school. (Center for Disease Control, Interim Report of Pennsylvania House of Representatives, The University of Michigan, Metropolitan Life Insurance Company and L. Harris and Associates)

Friday (1996) reports on the frequencies of the occurrences being much higher than they had been in subsequent decades. Lawrence (1964-1999) has corroborated Friday over the past 35 years. But according to Friday:

> The CDC's YRBS reported that in 1990 about 20 percent of all students in grades 9 through 12 reported having carried a weapon such as a gun, knife, or club anywhere on one or more days during the thirty days preceding the survey. Of these students, more than one-third (36 percent) reported carrying a weapon six or more times during the previous thirty days. Subsequent surveys showed increases in weapon-carrying among this population. In 1991 reports of weapon-carrying increased dramatically to 26 percent, although this rise may be due to a change in the structure of the question. There were slight declines in 1993, when 22 percent reported carrying a weapon. Also

> in 1993, nearly 12 percent of students reported having carried any weapon onto school property at least once in the thirty days prior to the survey. (Friday, 1996)

In addition, the National Goals Report "found that in 1992, 9 percent of eighth-graders, 10 percent of tenth-graders, and 6 percent of twelfth graders reported having brought a weapon to school at least once during the previous month. Of this group, 2, 4, and 3 percent, respectively, reported carrying a weapon on ten or more days in the previous month." (Friday, 1996) Another study found that in ten inner-city schools in four states, 22 percent of the students had carried a gun outside of school while 6 percent had carried a gun to school once in awhile. (Sheley, McGee and Wright, 1992)

Furthermore, the demographics of weapon-carrying has become more intense and changed since past decades. "In general, weapons (including guns) are more likely to be carried by younger than older students, by males more than by females, by blacks more than by Hispanics, by Hispanics more than by whites, and by those in urban more than in suburban or rural geographic locations." (Friday, 1996) Age characteristics suggest that school studies:

> ...have looked at students in grades 9 through 12, and all show the same basic trend: younger students are more likely than older students to be in fights, to carry weapons, and to be victimized. Current data suggest that both physical fighting and weapon-carrying decrease as grade level and age increase. Ninth-graders are much more likely than twelfth-graders to be in a fight or carry weapons in and around school. (Friday, 1996)

Males are three times more likely than females to carry weapons. Black and Hispanic students are more likely to carry guns to school than are whites and they are far more likely to be victims of such behavior. Urban and suburban youth are twice as likely as rural youth to be victims of violence. Other studies show that 19 percent of urban students were in a fight last year while 20 percent of suburban youth were. Sixty-two percent of urban youth report they can get a gun, 58 percent of suburban youth report the same while 56 percent of rural youth are able to get guns. (Harris, 1993) Various studies show a wide variety of weapons which have recently been confiscated by school officials: guns and bullets, knives, brass knuckles, box cutters, mace, pipes, smoke bombs, ax handles, tire irons, scissors, hatchets, hammers and razor blades. (Northrop and Hamrick, 1990; Georgia Department of Education, 1993; National School Safety Center, 1993)

Various reasons for carrying weapons have been cited by students with the main reason given for self protection. They also show off to impress peers, to make themselves feel important and to emulate others. In another study, teachers, students and law enforcement gave four key reasons why students carry weapons: 1) for protection on the way to school; 2) for impressing their friends; 3) for self esteem; and 4) for protection while at school. In the National Crime Survey, fewer than 20 percent of students stated their fear of victimization. Past victims of crimes were three more times likely to be afraid than those who had not been past victims and younger students expressed more fear than older students. (Harris, 1993; Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, 1993; Center for Disease Control, 1993; Bastian and Taylor, 1991)

Sociological and social-psychological theories have tried to explain the intensifying, violent behaviors exhibited by youth in America. Behaviorists suggest that when violent youth get reinforced for acts of violence, they are prone to repeat violent acts. The rewards are diverse: commodities such as food or shoes, symbols in the form of money or status, sex and victim submission as well as out-of-control wilding behaviors related to thrills and power. A sense of power by extinction of the victim may also lend satisfaction.

Youth violence may be learned through what Sutherland calls differential association. If youth associate with violent offenders, they are more likely to become violent than those who do not associate with violent juveniles or adults. Sutherland's theory suggests that: 1) criminal behavior is learned; 2) criminal behavior is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication; 3) criminal behavior is learned principally within intimate, personal groups; 4) criminal behavior involves a) specific techniques of committing crimes and b) specific direction of motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes; 5) specific direction of motives and drives is learned from definitions of the legal codes as favorable or unfavorable; 6) delinquency occurs as an excess of definitions favorable to law breaking over definitions unfavorable to law breaking; 7) differential associations may vary in frequency, duration, priority and intensity; 8) processes of learning criminal behaviors by association with criminal and anti-criminal patterns involve all the mechanisms of any other learning; and, 9) while criminal behavior is an expression of general needs and values, it is not explained by those general needs and values since non-criminal behavior is an expression of the same needs and values. (Sutherland in Giallombardo, pp. 89-91)

Opportunities to learn crime through role modeling theory increase the likelihood that media will have an impact. While real life opportunities afford chances for definitions of crime, media increase these opportunities exponentially. In addition, fantasies allow villains to come back time after time until anti-heroes begin to take on positive survival characteristics which many inner urban youth prioritize higher than avoidance. While children are ordinarily reared in families, many inner urban youth do not have positive role model opportunities to capitalize on from same gender individuals. "...high crime rate is due to social disorganization. The term, social disorganization is not entirely satisfactory, and it seems preferable to substitute for it the term, differential social organization....crime is rooted in the social organization and is an expression of that social organization. A group may be organized for criminal behavior or against criminal behavior. Most communities are organized for criminal and anti-criminal behavior, and in that sense the crime rate is an expression of the differential group association." (Sutherland in Giallombardo, Ibid.) This approach would help explain the rapid growth of gang activities and gang-related violence. Sutherland's theory might be applied as the following:

1. Individual violence is learned in interaction with other persons in a process of communication, principally within intimate personal groups. (This might help explain both Jonesboro and Columbine.)
2. People not only learn techniques of being violent but also motives, drives, rationalizations, and attitudes toward violence. (This is where media violence plays such a critical role.)
3. People use violence because of an excess of definitions favorable to using violence over definitions unfavorable to using violence. (This would be helpful in understanding how gangs are so convincing to youth involved in crime.)
4. The most significant associations for learning violence are those that are the most frequent, endure the longest, take place earliest in life, and are the most emotional or meaningful to an individual. (This might help explain the impact of a culture of inner city, poverty-stricken, anomic families and neighborhoods.)
5. The particular mechanisms of learning violent behavior are the same as those involved in any other learning. (Criminals may be smart and they may learn from legitimate school activities, media or from other criminals while incarcerated.)

Therefore, subcultural theory may complement differential association. If the subcultural group approves of violence, connects honor and manliness with violence, then the propensity to accept violence as an acceptable means to ends exists. "Because their peers consider violence appropriate for a relatively large number of situations, violence is common, and it becomes necessary to carry weapons, both for protection and as a symbol of one's manly willingness to be violent." (Henslin, p. 147) Violence is often more acceptable to some groups than to others. Horowitz (1983) found these principles to apply to Chicano gang life while doing participant observation:

> Differential association and subcultural theory can be fit together to explain why people kill one another, even over apparently inconsequential matters. According to subcultural theory, violence is more acceptable to some groups than to others. According to differential association, people who associate with such groups learn that violence is a suitable response to many of the problems of life. (Henslin, p. 147)

Challenges to self concept and reputation may be met with violence.

These symbolic interactionist theories suggest that we may find violence more acceptable among males than females. But how do we explain the rise of female-initiated violence? Female gang members? Symbolic interactionism also suggests a social class difference with more acceptable violent definitions in lower than middle and upper classes. But how does this explain the growing number of middle and upper class youth involved in wilding sprees? Symbolic interactionists also suggest that subcultural minority groups utilize violence more than do mainstream majority status groups. A conspicuous ingredient of gang culture..."is an emphasis on group autonomy, or intolerance of restraint except from the informal pressures within the group itself. Relations between gang members tend to be solidary and imperious. Relations with other groups tend to be indifferent, hostile or rebellious." (Cohen, 1958). While Cohen was describing delinquent gangs in large urban areas, his characterizations could also be true of dyads or triads as found in smaller urban or rural settings such as Jonesboro and Columbine. Cohen continues:

> Gang members are unusually resistant to the efforts of home, school and other agencies to regulate, not only their delinquent activities, but any activities carried on within the group, and to efforts to compete with the gang for the time and other resources of its

> members. It may be argued that the resistance of gang members to the authority of the home may not be a result of their membership in gangs, on the contrary, is a result of ineffective family supervision, the breakdown of parental authority and the hostility of the child toward the parents; in short, that the delinquent gang recruits members who already achieved autonomy. (Cohen, 1958)

It is not the individual, but the gang, or group, that is autonomous. Perpetrators like those in Jonesboro and Columbine may have found their autonomous self expression in each other. The delinquent group offers a new status impossible to find in the child's family. The group's values then begin to outweigh those of the school or family. Electronic communication devices expand the influence of these groups as never before and present a rapidly-growing, new type of subcultural group.

Labeling theory contains another set of theoretical perspectives which may be useful in understanding recent juvenile wilding trends. Labels often suggest a set of expectations. As such, labels may be understood in terms of both positive and negative self-fulfilling prophecies. The power of labeling symbols may have an impact within the family, at school, with law enforcement, and inside the criminal justice system itself. Once labeled, it will be exceedingly difficult for youth to shed all traces of negative expectations held in the views of others. Self efficacy and self regulation may be used in research paradigms to better understand the phenomena of how to overcome negative labeling. This theoretical contruct may have helped in understanding how to prevent some wilding episodes before they get started. One of the boys in Jonesboro, Arkansas, the young man in Springfield, Oregon, and both of the young men at Columbine in Littleton, Colorado may have had their lives turned around if significant others had used positive expectations and labeling theory coincidentally. Labeling theory is concerned with norm violations. According to Howard Becker:

> ...social groups create deviance by making the rules whose infraction constitutes deviance, and by applying those rules to particular people and labeling them as outsiders. From this point of view, deviance is not a quality of the act the person commits, but rather a consequence of the application by others of rules and sanctions to 'outsiders.' The deviant is one to whom that label has been successfully applied; deviant behavior is behavior that people so label. (Becker, 1963)

This leads to a need to describe functionalist perspectives of youth violence. Some theoreticians have referred to criminal violence as a 'normal' part of any society. Dislocated society may eventually lead to anomie, uprooted feelings of unconnectedness. Goal strain and control (containment) theories also have their place in structural-functionalism. Durkheim found a country's rate of violence so regular that future rates could be predicted from it—normal violence. "Crime is present not only in the majority of societies of one particular species but in all societies of all types. There is no society that is not confronted with the problem of criminality." (Durkheim, 1966) Imagine a community where everyone knows each other. Close bonds keep individuals in check. Following rules is important for social standing and community survival. High social integration keeps levels of violence low:

> Now imagine the same community undergoing rapid social change. It is industrializing, and the villagers are leaving for low-paying, unskilled jobs in cities, where they know few people. Both husbands and wives take jobs outside the home. The children go to schools where they spend long hours with teachers who are unknown to the family. They live surrounded by strangers, accumulate debts on the installment plan, and face the threat of unemployment. These characteristics, virtually unknown in non-industrialized societies, tend to estrange people from one another—and to make them feel normless, no longer knowing what rules to apply to the troublesome situations they face. Durkheim gave the name **anomie** to such feelings of being unconnected and uprooted. Under these circumstances, impulses to violence no longer have the contraints they did in the village. The city then becomes a more dangerous place. (Henslin, 1996)

Robert Merton, using Durkheim's concept of anomie, developed strain theory, "how some social structures exert a definite pressure upon certain persons in the society to engage in nonconformist rather than conformist conduct." (Merton in Giallombardo, 1972) In order to understand social structure, strain theory and delinquency, there are two important elements of the socio-cultural structure. First, there are culturally defined goals, purposes and interests. Second, the social structure defines the acceptable means of achieving these goals. "Every social group invariably couples its scale of desired ends with moral or institutional regulation of permissible and required procedures for attaining these ends. These regulatory norms and moral imperatives do not necessarily coincide with technical or efficiency norms." (Merton in

Giallombardo, 1972) Success is a cultural goal; approved ways of reaching this goal (work and education) are cultural means. But everyone does not have access to the same cultural means. The imbalance between goals and means is strain. This frustration becomes a motive for crime, including violent crime. This goal strain produces five categories of behavioral responses:

1) conformity: most people follow this adaptation most of the time; students learn this through formal means and in the "hidden" curriculum of rules and regulations
2) innovation: this is the most common deviant pattern; the individual accepts the social goal, but opportunity to satisfy it is blocked; this helps explain why inner cities and other deprived environments have high rates of violent crime; they have high rates of unemployment, inadequate schools, racial and ethnic discrimination, so they innovate illegitimate means; after extended failure, the goals may even be rejected because they require too much effort;
3) ritualism: because there are many failures and accompanying loss of self esteem, more ambitious goals are rejected in favor of scaling down goals to meet one's economic and social obligations; rejecting society's goals for gang-related ones helps explain how some students look for status within their own worlds; to destroy obstacles in the way of status seekers takes on a subcultural meaning of its own;
4) retreatism: these people take ritualism one step further; they reject legitimate means as well as goals; many of these youth wind up in the criminal justice system and reject learning in school all together; violent means are justified and the shooting of fellow youths may present the ultimate status—fear in others
5) rebellion: these youths may be retreatists, but also have an alternative set of values which they want to substitute; here, ambition and success, the same motives that produced conformity, now produce nonconformity; eventually they will look for counter-culture values to be accepted by the larger society; they work actively to overturn the status of existing values (Merton, 1968)

Since we all have some goals blocked, Merton's theory seems to explain why some people are violent, but fails to explain why others are not. Control, or containment, theory attempts to do this by assuming that all people have a natural tendency toward violence. Walter Reckless said that two systems work to control our natural push/pull inclinations toward violence. Inner containment refers to the person's capacity to withstand pressures to be violent. Outer containment refers to groups in society, like family, peers, and the state, which divert people away from violence. If the control systems are too weak, violence occurs. These categories may be broken into four factors: a) direct control which comes from discipline, restrictions, punishments; b) internalized control which is the inner control of conscience; c) indirect control which is exerted by not wanting to hurt or go against the wishes of parents or other individuals with whom the person identifies; and d) the availability of alternative means to goals. A favorable self concept helps buffer one from violent crime. "Containment theory points to the regulation of normative behavior through resistance to deviancy as well as through direction toward legitimate social expectations." (Reckless in Giallombardo, 1972) Reckless cites seven tests of validity for containment theory:

1) it is the best theory of fit for a large number of cases of delinquency and crime;
2) it explains crimes against persons as well as crimes against property;
3) it represents a format which psychiatrists, psychologists and sociologists may all use equally as practitioners;
4) inner and outer containment may be discovered in individual case studies;
5) containment theory is a valid operational theory for treatment of offenders, for building up self concept;
6) containment theory is also an effective operational theory for prevention;
7) internal and external containment can be assessed and approximated; (Reckless, 1972)

While Reckless' theory works well for most juvenile crime, it is hard to use for extreme violence or wilding. The 16 year-old boy who shot nine students, killing two peers and his mother in Pearl, Mississippi was obviously short in both inner and outer containment, eliminating his closest outer containment. It is easy to see how medical models could use containment to treat after the fact, but how can it be used in prevention efforts raises important questions. Wilding episodes will be difficult to prevent

without long-term commitments by entire communities. A total community philosophy is not new. Walter Miller suggests that there must be two major community elements:

> The community program involved two major efforts: 1) the development and strengthening of local citizens' groups so as to enable them to take direct action in regard to local problems, including delinquency, and 2) an attempt to secure cooperation between those professional agencies whose operations in the community in some way involved adolescents (e.g., settlement houses, churches, schools, psychiatric and medical clinics, police, courts and probation departments, corrections and parole departments). A major short-term objective was to increase the possibility of concerted action both among the professional agencies themselves and between the professionals and the citizens' groups. The ultimate objective of these organizational efforts is to focus a variety of diffuse and uncoordinated efforts on problems of youth and delinquency in a single community so as to bring about more effective processes of prevention and control. (Miller, 1962)

Work within families and gangs is targeted within this approach. This perspective is one that has finally come into its own during the 1990s.

The recent wave of school violence in the past eighteen months has disturbed parents, educators, policy makers, and school children themselves. Student assaults on other students have reached a wilding frenzy. On October 1, 1997, a 16 year-old boy killed his mother, and then shot nine students, killing two in Pearl, Mississippi. Two months later on December 1, 1997, a 14 year-old boy shot and killed three fellow students and wounded five others while the students were having prayer in Paducah, Kentucky. Of twenty three school-aged children in Lynchburg, Virginia, all believed these acts were morally wrong no matter what the rationale was for committing these acts. Of one hundred eighty nine students in four sections of two different teacher education courses, not one accepted these acts as legitimate conflict resolution no matter what the problems faced by the perpetrators. One hundred eleven sociology students could not see any purpose to these senseless slayings.

Then, on March 24, 1998, two young adolescents in Jonesboro, Arkansas opened fire on hundreds of school children who unknowingly left the school when a false fire alarm was pulled. Four girls and one teacher were killed at the middle school. These acts of wanton wilding were planned in advance by an 11 year-old boy and his 13 year-old cousin. They claimed it was a copy cat portrayal of an unsuccessful attempt earlier that school year in another Arkansas community. One month later, on April 24, 1998, a 14 year-old student shot a science teacher to death in front of classmates at an eighth grade graduation dance. Sixteen school-aged children seemed to be more disturbed about the Jonesboro slayings because of the intensity of those acts. When questioned, they all believed that the older of the two should be tried as an adult. Twelve of the students believed that the younger boy should also be tried as an adult. All sixteen believed that it could happen in their own schools.

In the same school year, on May 19, 1998, an 18 year-old honor student opened fire in a high school parking lot, killing a classmate who was dating his ex-girlfriend in Fayetteville, Tennessee. On May 21, 1998, in Springfield, Oregon, a 15 year-old boy opened fire at a high school, killing two and injuring twenty three more students. Later, his parents were found murdered at his home. Then, before that school year ended, a student shot his teacher to death in front of other students in Richmond, Virginia. All sixteen school-aged children interviewed believed that each of these perpetrators should be tried as adults. When probed, they believed the older age of these boys differentiated them from the Jonesboro killers. They also believed that this might deter others from acting out their aggressions in the same manner. Three months later, only one had changed her mind, believing they should be imprisoned for life.

After a relatively peaceful school year, another wilding spree broke out in U.S. schools during the month of April, 1999. On April 16, 1999, a high school sophomore opened fire in a school hallway firing two shots. No one was injured as he was quickly apprehended. Then, on April 20, 1999, two teenagers, aged 18 and 17, dressed in black trench coats opened fire inside their high school campus at Columbine School in Littleton, Colorado. They killed twelve students and one teacher and injured twenty-three others before killing themselves.

The Columbine slayings seem to have set off an immediate wave of school violence after such a tumultuous school year of 1997-98. On April 22, 1999, in Scotlandville, Louisiana, a 14 year-old boy opened fire on a middle school, injuring a fourteen year-old girl. He was aiming for a student he had previously argued with. Four days later, on April 26, 1999, four eighth-grade boys were taken into police custody on charges of conspiracy to commit murder, arson, and manufacturing explosives to use in

targeting their school in Wimberley, Texas. The next day, on April 27, 1999, a 13 year-old boy was arrested for threatening to place a bomb in his school. His plans to hide the pipe bomb in his school, and shoot his fellow eighth-grade students were discovered in Longwood, Florida. On April 29, 1999, a copy cat bomb threat caused police and firemen to comb Sandusky Middle School in Lynchburg, Virginia with dogs.

Community-wide approaches of collaboration and partnerships will be necessary to check the rapid rise of youth violence across the United States. There is a need for interdisciplinary, broad-based, community responses to violence. Collaborative efforts among schools, community agencies, policy makers, parents, students and other stakeholders must be initiated. These collaborative partnerships must go beyond the classroom to make an impact on violence reduction. There must be strong and consistent disciplinary action toward weapons violations, substance abuse, and assault violations. Schools need to report violations to local law enforcement. Parents and guardians of children coming from outside a school district to a new one should be required to indicate any prior expulsions for weapons or assault violations.

Each school board should review its own policies and regulations concerning conduct and management of all members of the public coming on school property. Expectations and requirements should be well publicized for anyone accompanying and supervising children during evening and after school programs as well as for field trips. Appropriate systems for telecommunications may be required. Each school must work with parents and other members of the public to provide parental support and outreach required to strengthen home-school partnerships. Schools will also need to develop plans and curricula to support at-risk children. State boards of education working with legislatures and juvenile courts need to appoint task forces to study alternative education programs for severely disruptive and violent youth. States should make violence prevention an integral part of K-12 curricula and involve students in conflict resolution, peer mediation, citizenship, problem solving, and other decision making concerning civic responsibility.

A total community approach would stress prevention and intervention with follow up. Schools need strong peer mediation and conflict resolution programs. There needs to be systematic mediation of any and all gang disputes. There should be a school-based program for parent/child mediation so that families may be strengthened, not weakened. There also needs to be some sort of school/neighborhood mediation for a safer community. Schools working alone and without community support will likely fail. Each district should analyze and use its own data and other state and federal data to identify the extent and type of student behaviors to determine specific prevention and intervention measures for specific communities. Safe homes and safe schools go hand in hand in the community. Parents, teachers, students and all members of the community need to role model the value of life. Tougher penalties for student violations need to be developed. The media should be used to elevate the consciousness of all members of the public concerned about school violence. Media should promote youth positively and give attention to youth accomplishments. Conferences should be called to address the following: 1) better defined rules and regulations; 2) greater access to and allocation of information; 3) better coordination of agencies that work with youth; 4) alternative education focused on habitual discipline offenders and school-to-work transitions; 5) ways to manage disruptive students; 6) peer mediation intervention; 7) delinquency prevention; 8) conflict resolution curricula; 9) sexual harassment awareness; 10) issues of confidentiality; 11) understanding differences and similarities in multicultural social environments; 12) identification of gang behavior; 13) nature of hate crimes; 14) research and dissemination.

School mediation should design both elementary and secondary programs. Both levels should integrate curricula, focus on problem solving and communication, teach listening skills, help youth to understand their feelings, help youth to manage their anger, and have various opportunities for students to take multiple perspectives. District teams should plan and identify trainers. Success should be operationally defined and carefully researched both quantitatively and qualitatively. Measures should examine self confidence, self esteem, self efficacy, self regulation, problem solving skills, leadership skills, communication skills, alternatives to violence, methods of dispute resolution, active listening, changed attitudes about conflict, and understanding how to cope with peer pressure.

In addition, school safety and security needs to focus on data collection and analysis of disciplinary referrals. Good programs will continually refine their management of security. Specific law enforcement services need to be articulated. Security- related policies and procedures need to be continually updated. Entrances to school property should be secured and monitored periodically during school hours as should parking lots, driveways and open spaces. Trees and shrubbery that obstruct clear views should be removed. Locked doors should constantly be checked and maintained. All employees

should have picture identities. Spread out responsibility for school safety to all concerned and be sure to allocate enough resources to do the job well.

There are some interesting initiatives around the country which might provide exemplary programming for communities wanting to begin with measures which have shown some success. A myriad of programs have been established in Texas focusing on curriculum, training, research, midnight sports, extracurricular activities and workforce preparation. Many have meshed cities, counties, schools, private and non-profit entities, universities and local law enforcement. One such program has been the Peer Assistance Network of Texas (PANTX). It has initiated peer mediation programs in hundreds of Texas school districts. Another successful initiative has combined two umbrella organizations—T-CAP. This program has combined 1) mayors united on safety, crime and law enforcement (MUSCLE) with 35% of the state's population where 60% of violent crimes in the state occur, and 2) the National Crime Prevention Council (NCPC). This utilizes resources from Texas' seven largest cities. The combined programs have improved community street lighting, job training, parenting classes, youth recreation and conflict resolution curricula with peer mediation. (National Crime Prevention Council, Nov. 1993)

Other Texas initiatives include the Corpus Christi Coalition for Crime Prevention. This program combines a community-wide effort with formal and informal education programs. Representatives from social services, juvenile probation offices, school administration, industry, neighborhood associations, United Way, YMCA, the Housing Authority and Boys and Girls Clubs of Corpus Christi have worked directly with the Mayor's Commission on Neighborhoods. This latter group has specialized in the information flow of the neighborhood watch for violence. Youth curfews have made great differences in crime against and by kids. Many cities have utilized curfews: Austin, Corpus Christi, Dallas, Paris, Tyler, Lubbock, San Antonio, Seguin, Texarkana, and Wichita Falls. The number of victims fell between 50% and 77% in each city with a novel daytime curfew in Austin reducing juvenile arrest rates by 25%. This effort also identified especially at-risk kids in need of long-term intervention. (Rogers, 1990; Richards, 1994)

Another Texas collaborative partnership to prevent and intervene in youth crime and violence has been the Industrial Areas Foundation founded by Ernesto Cortes more than two decades ago in the west San Antonio neighborhoods. This effort has integrated pastors, key lay leaders, PTA leaders, Boy Scouts, and baseball leagues. In 1974, these combined forces approached the city manager who called a special city council meeting and had the help of 27 church organizations. After this, they began training parents how to work with school leaders to reduce student violence in both the community at large and inside school environments. This led to the founding of Churches Committed To Texas Children. Baptists and Catholics reached more than 50% of the school populations. Priests and ministers began to teach children non-violent ways to solve problems. They set up after-school programs and began training adults and peers to participate in mentoring programs. They initiated programs to sponsor at-risk families and relied heavily on building church-to-church partnerships. (National Crime Prevention Council, Aug. 1993)

Yet another important Texas initiative has been the Casey Foundation 3rd Ward Houston project. Fund raising established $150,000 for planning and another $3 million to implement the program over a 4-year period to combat drugs, violence and death. The Casey Foundation allows the 3rd Ward to let the community to self determine which services are to be prioritized and empowers every level of government (city, county, school district, and the state) to work directly with the 3rd Ward. This helps insure success without going through various rungs of bureaucracy which often confuses goals, disrupts communication of information flows, and takes accountability and responsibility away from local control. The Casey Foundation established local governance structures and created a 29-member 3rd Ward board consisting of local community residents. One sub-committee of the 3rd Ward Project is the Establish Family Advocacy Network, a parental body which has helped design the 'Touch Every Home Campaign' block walks to reach all residents for the purpose of promoting awareness and action against community violence. The Casey Foundation further created a family problem solving program called In-House Family Assistance which has provided intensive, school-based mental health services for 15 children with various professionals. They have also created 'Kick Drugs Out Of The 3rd Ward karate classes and support groups to six Ward schools during regular school hours. (Lawrence, 1995)

Other states have also initiated effective strategies and programs of conflict resolution. Virginia's Education Summit of 1992 established school safety zones in partnership with a variety of community agencies and schools. Virginia's regional call to action provided the impetus to form various Safe Schools Regional Task Forces. These task forces sought legislative support for action against youth violence. A key component in Virginia has been gun and other weapon control. The initiatives have been the

elimination of youth access to guns and the intensification of penalties for adults selling guns to youth. Another element has been to increase parental responsibility by holding parents accountable for their children's actions. It works because school districts have kept parents informed of regulations and discipline guidelines and insisting that parents must accept responsibility for their children. In addition, there has been greater coordination between police, courts and schools. More information is shared so that schools may take appropriate safety precautions and effective interventions. There has also been an increased development of alternative educational settings for student violators. The biggest criticism of the Virginia initiatives has been the need to stress prevention before the fact more than intervention after the fact. Community empowerment, doing "with" not "for" parents, caretakers and children, seeks to include the entire community in the initiation of planning and broader decision making responsibilities. The inclusion of all community groups, formal and informal, will also help insure future success. Lifelong processes of valuing ethnic and cultural diversity will lift the programs to higher levels of cultural competency. Recently, Lynchburg, Virginia and Amherst County Schools have agreed to pilot a program which will encourage anonymous phone tips from students on matters of violence, weapons, and substance abuse. (Lawrence, 1999)

New Mexico and New York have also developed effective model programs in implementing effective conflict resolution for youth. The New Mexico Center for Dispute Resolution (NMCDR) for children and families was piloted in 1984. One of the most violent states in the country for teenagers, two elementary schools began peer mediation in that first year. Ten years later, 250 elementary and secondary schools used NMCDR programs. NMCDR has a parent/child mediation component. This segment helps families negotiate daily living agreements and prevents runaways, high truancy levels, teen pregnancy and incorrigible behavior. The violence intervention program teaches conflict resolution skills to violent juvenile offenders and helps parents monitor their children while they are on intensive probation. A victim and juvenile offender program brings offenders and victims together to negotiate restitution. In addition, there is a component in juvenile corrections settings. It works to mediate youth conflict while in the facility itself. Finally, there is a school-based component which attempts to change both students and school culture. NMCDR has a three-prong approach: delinquency prevention, child abuse prevention, and violence prevention. As a prevention program, committed to positive forms of expression, it combines conflict management with communication and problem solving skills for staff and students. Conflict resolution curricula have peer mediation components. Much research shows the programs to be effective. (Jenkins & Smith, 1987; Carter, 1990; Steele, 1991; Martinez, 1994; Lawrence, 1994-95)

New York also has developed a set of powerful conflict resolution programs. After extensive research findings that more than 60% of the homicides in the United States are committed among people who know each other, that homicide is the 3rd leading cause of death for children 5-14, that the leading cause of death for Afro-Americans of the same age group is homicide, that guns take a child's life every two hours, and that kids in the United States are 15 times as likely to die by gunfire as kids in Northern Ireland, the New York City schools began to implement the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP). (Lantieri, DeJong, and Dutrey, 1996) New York policy makers also reviewed one of the Annenberg reports of the University of Pennsylvania which, among other things, showed that television reinforces violence as a legitimate method of conflict resolution with 5.3 violent scenes per hour, 52% of dramatic characters engaging in violence, and on Saturday morning children's programming one may watch 23 violent scenes per hour. (Children's Defense Fund, 1994; U. of Pennsylvania Annenberg School of Communication, Jan. 1994) The RCCP began in 1985 in 28 of 32 New York City school districts. Less than 40,000 elementary and middle school children were piloted, accounting for about 5% of the total number of students in New York City schools. (DeJong, 1994; Wilson-Brewer, 1990)

By 1993, 120,000 children in all but a few schools were active in the nation's largest conflict resolution program—RCCP. The cost ran at about $33 per pupil per year. The primary foci were active listening, assertiveness, expression of feelings, perspective taking, cooperation, negotiation, and countering bias. Each teacher teaches one peace lesson per week infused into the curriculum. Activities require active participation and interaction, role playing, interviewing, cooperative group dialogues and brainstorming. Special needs students also participate with the same lessons broken into smaller tasks. One key element is the use of multicultural appreciation to reduce bias and prejudice. One enormous commitment has been the construction of new, smaller schools. The conflict resolution curricula are infused with peer mediation. Peer mediation is not a substitute for discipline, but uses 'principled negotiation' for mutual problem solving with a 'Win/Win' strategy for all parties. (Lawrence, 1998)

Two teachers and the principal of each school participate in professional development for peace studies before school begins each year. Funding limitations have kept many teachers from being able to participate. The $10,000 per year per school allots enough to train two or three parents for 60 hours each summer. Then, the parents lead two four and one-half day workshops for other interested parents. In 1992, the Center for Disease Control (CDC) evaluated the program and, as a result of a favorable assessment, provided additional funding. Findings included high enthusiasm, reduced name calling, reduced fighting, and 71% of the teachers agreed with these findings while 98% believed that peer mediation was having a positive effect. The teachers were applying concepts to their own lives as well. (Bailin, 1991; Center for Disease Control, 1992)

One of CDC's findings was that there was a need to provide more learning continuity for youth who had been removed from school. Coordination of schools and agencies was seen as a paramount and immediate need. One problem was that there was no prior notice of returning a potentially violent child to school. Therefore, the division of Youth/Juvenile Justice agency needed to do more work receiving, preparing and articulating processes for violent youth in learning settings. A broad outreach was needed for judges and courts informing them of how their decisions could enhance the learning of juvenile offenders. (Center for Disease Control, 1993; Cortines, 1996) Many children became homeless upon their release from protective and punitive agencies. All of the halfway, settlement houses had been closed in New York City. This posed especially serious problems for children 16 year of age and older who—in turn—became problems for Human Resource Administration agencies. This placed unnecessary pressure on foster care agencies, but was at a critical limit concerning recidivism in the penal institutions. One study in the Bronx showed that first-time, non-violent offenders did exceptionally well in education rehabilitation with only 4% being rearrested compared to 75% in a control group. The cost effectiveness could not be challenged either as students educationally rehabilitated cost the state less than $5,000 per year while those incarcerated cost more than $50,000 per year. Those incarcerated learned a great deal more about crime while they were serving time. (Lawrence, 1995)

There are some other important findings of the RCCP program of New York. Special needs children, while posing some specific due process concerns, performed well and measures of self efficacy and self regulation were high when compared to the general student population. Expanded extracurricular activities also made a difference for all students. Junior varsity athletic teams were expanded at the middle school and high school levels. An outstanding community project, The Beacon Program, was expanded allowing school buildings to stay open at night and be used for community action. This allowed increased access to libraries and computers which continued to raise self efficacy and self regulation in the targeted student populations. Some additional funding was made available for security and staff after hours. Many members of the community donated their time freely. (Cortines, 1996)

Community collaboration enhanced school safety and security in more direct ways too. Wand detectors and walk-through detectors reduced weapon carrying violations by more than 50%. This method uncovered more than 17% of all confiscated weapons in the school districts. School safety officer training improved and an extra officer was hired for each school. The new officers were assigned to electronic detection and increased the monitoring of school entrances in the morning and at dismissal times major corridors. Regular law enforcement increased surveillance activities at train stations, subways, and bus stops. Cooperation with the New York City Police Departments was evident in the communities. (Cortines, 1996)

The Resolving Conflicts Creatively Program (RCCP) began intensive concentration on structuring relationships between peaceable schools and peaceable communities and neighborhoods. Schools reached out to community-based youth programs of all kinds. Teachers were encouraged to interact more with parents, police, religious leaders, and other community leaders. A U.S. Department of Justice study showed that increased tutoring, mentoring and the nighttime athletic leagues improved academic achievement and raised self esteem. Other efforts in creating peaceable neighborhoods included increased access to preventive health care for all residents, improved treatment for alcohol and drug addiction, and improved housing coupled with better economic opportunities. The stress was on common community problems requiring coordinated common solutions. The approach was quite like what William Heard Kilpatrick had called the Project Method earlier this century. Growing out of the RCCP, communities began to create neighborhood clusters and allocated resources to decentralized Safe Schools Groups (parent and community leader advisory councils with 24 hour hotlines and security officers coaching and refereeing the nightime athletic leagues. (Bastian and Taylor, 1991; DeJong, 1994; Lantieri, DeJong, and Dutrey, 1996)

The meaning of danger and managing conflict for youth populations has many dimensions. It includes personal and interpersonal, or social, configurations. Besides the physical there is a psychological concern; two major growing concerns are cluster suicides and wilding episodes. There is also an increased concern about the role of institutions. Corporations are making more and more unsafe products in an era of decreased regulation. Pharmaceutical and tobacco companies are but two examples. Sexual harassment and date rape are two growing problems which have led to changing legal perspectives as has the increased number of female members of gangs, all-female gangs, and female perpetrators of crime. Another change meriting investigation is the rise of visual police brutality. On top of all this is the increased production of weapons both inside and outside of the United States and the ease with which they enter into youth populations.

Conflict has been viewed as a natural part of society. Democracies have to manage conflict and channel it into interest group politics, but the media has aggravated the ways that children view what is legitimate means within society. Multicultural education has had some success in overcoming violence which grows out of cultural and other ethnic differences. Institutional maintenance of violence has been questioned by educational policy makers, especially since World War Two. Recent research has demonstrated the social significance of schools and their relationships to a peaceful, stable society. During the past two generations, however, increased violence in and outside schools has been a growing concern of educators, parents, children and citizens throughout America's communities. Schools have responded by trying to teach passive and assertive strategies. However, during this same time period as violence increased from World War Two until the mid-1990s, more aggressive treatments have been analyzed. Finally, as the sheer numbers of violent juvenile crime slightly waned, intense, wilding episodes have increased. This, in turn, has caused policy makers to begin intensified mediation of conflicts with various community methodologies in order to minimize school disruptions and keep the peace in and outside of schools.

Of the earlier theoreticians mentioned above, Miller's total community approach seems to be the most inclusive method of addressing youth and violence in and outside of schools. An eclectic approach integrating all of the theories reviewed above seems appropriate with each community having to determine which ones are most relevant for their specific problems and challenges. Schools alone cannot solve the multiple challenges created in today's society for American youth. However, working with various social institutions they may be able to make significant improvements compared to what has occurred over the past two generations. The solutions must be community wide, however. In addition to educational approaches, industries will have to self regulate themselves (media, weapons manufacturers, and substance producers, e.g., alcohol and tobacco). If not, the government may well have to try innovative, interactive, cooperative approaches at all levels of government, but spearheaded by the citizenry at the local levels of control. Families need to lead parental partnerships with schools and other community institutions, including businesses and local Chambers of Commerce.

Approaches used to control and help youth exercise self control should be synthesized from all the various theoretical approaches reviewed earlier. Any new perspectives, or combinations of practices based on the amalgamation of such deviant theories should be continually refined and implemented into school and community-wide practices such as some of the ones reviewed here. A good start would be local, state and federal leaders enacting juvenile justice legislation which considers safety and constitutional rights protections alongside one another. If the High Court should overturn any new laws or rules and regulations legislative bodies should begin rewriting bills immediately with improved constitutional language. New laws should at least consider requiring background checks of gun buyers at gun shows and those who buy from individual collectors. Saving the lives of school children seems to outweigh the needs for buyers and sellers to preserve some sort of anonymity. Other legislative considerations should research the need for youth convicted of violent crimes ever being able to legally own firearms. Comprehensive prevention should also investigate the need for all handguns to use child safety devices, including trigger locks, lock boxes, and placing limitations on youth purchases of ammunition. Although these would not be fail-safe requirements, gun owners who use the safety devices could be protected from various torts, including negligence. Banning the importation of high capacity ammunition clips should also be considered. Assault weapons and high-capacity, ammunition clips should be targeted by lawmakers as well. The gun industry, itself, needs to review its policies and practices concerning minors as targets for gun sales. Both houses of the legislature at state and federal levels should study the problems comprehensively and act together since these problems face all levels of society.

In a democracy, continual conflict and harmony restoration need to be constantly assessed and evaluated because conflicts of interests and values will arise and reoccur in the diverse individual and institutional elements. With implicit and explicit beliefs in the capacity for rational behavior, democracy must rely on peaceful methods of conflict resolution through inquiry, discussion and persuasion as opposed to exerting power in the forms of threats of violence. Therefore, educational policy making must continue to develop programs and curricula which cultivate reflective thinking, critical inquiry, and proactive actions which encourage peaceful coexistence. In these ways, children learn to practice peaceful governance throughout their educational careers and are ready to take leadership roles when they become adults. Then, perhaps, in answer to the question, 'Who's minding the children?' we may confidently answer 'We all are.' Constructive, proactive prevention coupled with community-wide responses, sound in theory and practice, may hold the key to a more constructive society as we move into a new, ever-challenging society in the next millennium.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
FOR
WHO'S MINDING THE CHILDREN:
JUVENILE VIOLENCE IN THE UNITED STATES
&
WHAT SCHOOL LEADERS CAN DO ABOUT IT

BY

DONNIE A. LAWRENCE

ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF EDUCATION, SOCIOLOGY & PSYCHOLOGY

LIBERTY UNIVERSITY

Allen-Hagen, B. and M. Sickmund, **Juveniles and Violence: Juvenile Offending and Victimization** (Washington, D.D.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1993)

Annenberg School for Communication, U. of Pennsylvania, **Television Violence Profile**, no. 16, Jan., 1994

Bailin, M.A., "Attributes of Successful Programs for Adolescents: What Works," **Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine** 67 (1991)

Bastian, L.D. and M. Taylor, **School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Survey Report** (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1991)

Becker, Howard, **Social Problems: A Modern Approach** (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1963)

Bell, C. "Traumatic Stress and Children in Danger," **Journal of Health Care for the Poor and Underserved**, Sept. 1991, 2(1)

Centers For Disease Control, "Violence-Related Attitudes and Behaviors of High School Students—New York City, 1992," **Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Reviews** 42 (1993)

Centers For Disease Control, "Violence-Related Attitudes and Behaviors: Youth Risk Behavior Survey—1993," **Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Reports** (1995);

Children's Defense Fund, **Cease Fire In The War Against Children**, brochure, 1994

Cloward, R.A. and L.E. Ohlin, **Delinquency and Opportunity** (New York: Free Press, 1960)

Cohen, Albert, "The Delinquency Subculture in Rose Giallombardo, ed., **Juvenile Delinquency** (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972)

Cortines, Ramon, "The New York City Board Of Education And Violence Prevention," in Allan Hoffman, ed., **Schools, Violence and Society** (Westport: Praeger, 1996)

Currie, Elliot, "Crime in World Perspective," in John Macionis and Nijole V. Benokraitis, eds., **Seeing Ourselves** (Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, 1998)

DeJong, W., **Preventing Interpersonal Violence Among Youth: An Introduction To School, Community, and Mass Media Strategies** (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, 1994)

Derber, Charles, **The Wilding Of America: How Greed And Violence Are Eroding Our Nation's Character** (New York: St. Martin's, 1996

DeSanto, Charles, Zondra Lindblade and Margaret Poloma, **Christian Perspectives On Social Problems** (Indianapolis: Wesley Press, 1992)

Durkheim, Emile, "The Functions of Crime," in John Macionis and Nijole V. Benokraitis, eds., **Seeing Ourselves** (Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, 1998)

Etzioni, Amitai, **The Spirit Of Community** (New York: Simon & Shuster, 1993)

Evans, D. and E.Z. Taylor, **Interim Report, Select Committee On Violence** (Harrisburg: Pennsylvania House Of Representatives, 1994)

Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, **Adolescent Suicide: Some Clues to Understanding and Prevention** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1997

Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, **Children and Television: A Primer For Parents** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1998)

Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, **Delinquency and Learning Disabilities** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1999)

Father Flanagan's Boys' Home, **Working With Aggressive Youth** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1998)

Freire, Paulo, **The Pedagogy Of The Oppressed** (New York: Seabury, 1970)
Friday, Jennifer, "Weapon-Carrying In Schools," in Hoffman, ed. **Schools, Violence, and Society** (Westport: Praeger, 1996)
Futrell, Mary, "Violence In The Classroom: A Teacher's Perspective," **Schools, Violence, and Society**, ed. Allan M. Hoffman (Westport: Praeger, 1996)
Garbarino, James, "Preventing Childhood Injury: Developmental and Mental Health Issues," **American Journal Of Orthopsychiatry,** 1988 58(1)
Garbarino, James, Nancy Dubrow, Kathleen Kostelny and Carole Pardo, **Children In Danger: Coping** With The Consequences Of Community Violence (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1992)
Georgia Department of Education, **Report of the Violence and Schools Task Force** (Atlanta: Georgia Department of Education, 1993)
Harris, L., A Survey Of **Experience, Perceptions, and Apprehensions About Guns Among Young People In America** (Chicago: LH Research for the Joyce Foundation, 1993)
Henslin, James, **Social Problems** (Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall, 1996)
Herron, Ron and Kathleen Sorensen, **Unmasking Sexual Con Games** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1999)
Hoffman, Allan, ed. **Schools, Violence and Society** (Westport: Praeger, 1996)
Horowitz, Ruth, "Community Tolerance of Gang Violence," **Social Problems**, 34, 5,
Horowitz, Ruth, **Honor and the American Dream: Culture and Identity in a Chicano Community** (New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press, 1983
Hyland, Terry and Jerry Davis, **Angry Kids, Frustrated Parents** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1999)
Jenkins, J. and M. Smith, **Mediation in the Schools Program Evaluation Report, 1986-87** (Albuquerque: New Mexico Center for Dispute Resolution, 1987)
Kozol, Jonathan, **Savage Inequalities: Children In America's Schools** (New York:. Crown, 1991)
Lawrence, D.A., unpublished research, 1964-1999
Martinez, E., Principal, Alameda Junior High School, Santa Fe, New Mexico, 1994
Mead, George Herbert, **Mind, Self and Society** (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1936)
Merton, Robert, "Social Structure and Anomie," in Rose Giallombardo, ed., **Juvenile Delinquency** (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972)
Metropolitan Life Insurance Company, **Survey of the American Teacher, 1993: Violence in America's Public Schools** (New York: Harris & Associates, 1993)
Miller, Walter, "The Impact of a 'Total Community' Delinquency Control Project," in Rose Giallombardo, ed., **Juvenile Delinquency** (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972)
Miller, Walter, "Violent Crimes in City Gangs," in Rose Giallombardo, ed., **Juvenile Delinquency** (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972)
National Crime Prevention Council, "Taking the Offensive to Prevent Crime: How Seven Cities Did It" (Nov 1993)
National School Boards Association, **Violence in the Schools** (Alexandria: National School Boards Association, 1994)
National School Safety Center, **Weapons and Schools** (Malibu: National School Safety Center, 1993)
Nish, Stephen, ed., **Good Ideas To Help Young People Develop Good Character** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1998)
Northrop, D. and K. Hamrick, **Weapons and Minority Youth Violence** (Boston: Education Development Center, 1990)
Phillips, J., "Juvenile Justice: Getting Tough On Young Offenders and Tightening Legal Options," **Austin-American Statesman** (Oct. 1994)
Provenzo, Eugene F., **Video Kids: Making Sense Of Nintendo** (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991)
Quinney, R., **Class, State and Crime** (New York: David McKay Co., 1977)
Reckless, Walter, "A New Theory of Delinquency and Crime," in Rose Giallombardo, ed., **Juvenile Delinquency** (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972)
Richards, Ann, Remarks at Dallas Press Conference, Aug. 9, 1994
Rogers, M.B., **Cold Anger: A Story of Faith and Power Politics** (Denton: University of North Texas Press, 1990)
Sheley, J.F., Z.T. McGee and J.D. Wright, "Gun-Related Violence in and around Inner-City Schools," **American Journal of Diseases of Children** 146 (1992); Smith, D. **Caught In The Crossfire: A**

Report On The Gun Violence In Our Nation's Schools (Washington, D.C.: Center To Prevent Handgun Violence, 1990)

Steele, P.D., **Youth Corrections Mediation Program: Final Report of Evaluation Activities** (Albuquerque: New Mexico Center for Dispute Resolution, 1991)

Sterba, Michael and Jerry Davis, **Dangerous Kids** (Boys Town: Boys Town Press, 1999)

Sternberg, Robert, **Beyond IQ: A Triarchic Theory of Human Intelligence** (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985)

Sutherland, Edwin, "Theory of Differential Association," in Rose Giallombardo, ed., **Juvenile Delinquency** (New York: Wiley & Sons, 1972)

U.S. Department of Education & U.S. Department of Justice, **Annual Report On School Safety, 1998** (Washington, D.C.: U.S.G.P.O., 1999)

U.S. Department of Justice, **School Crime: A National Crime Victimization Report, 2,** 1990;

Valois, R., M.L. Vincent, R.E. McKeown, C.Z. Garrison and S. Kirby, "Adolescent Risk Behaviors and the Potential for Violence: A Look At What's Coming To Campus," **Journal of American College Health** 41, no. 4 (1993)

Wilson-Brewer, R., **Violence Prevention for Early Teens: The State of the Art and Guidelines for Future Program Evaluation** (Newton: Education Development Center, 1990)

Yablonski, L., **The Violent Gang** (New York: MacMillan, 1962)

27 ⌐ Community Safety Zones

- Dr. William Glasser
- Institute for Control Theory, Reality Therapy & Quality Management
- 22024 Lassem Street
- Suite 102
- Chatsworth, CA
- 91311
- (808) 899-0688

28 ⌐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Aggressors, Victims & Bystanders: middle schools--12 classroom sessions
- Christine Blaber
- Education Development Center
- 55 Chapel St., Suite 25
- Newton, MA 02458
- 800-225-4276 ext. 2364
- E-mail: Cblaber@edc.org

29 ⌐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Anger Coping Program: middle schools for aggressive boys; 18 wk. Small groups;
- John E. Lochman, Prof./Saxon Chair Psych.
- Dept. of Psych Box 870348
- U. of Alabama
- Tuscaloosa, AL 35487
- (205) 348-5083; Fax: (205) 348-8648
- E-mail: jlochman@ GP.AS.UA.EDU

30 ⌐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety: 1998

- BASIS: middle schools--increased parental communication to decrease classroom disruptions & improve academics;
- Denise Gottfredson
- U. of Maryland/ Depart. Of Criminology
- Lefrak Hall, Room 2220
- College Park, MD (301) 405-4717
- E-mail: dgottfredson@bss2.umd.edu

31 ⌐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety: 1998

- Conflict Resolution: secondary--reduces fights & violence
- National Resource Center for Youth Service
- College for Continuing Education
- U. of Oklahoma, 202 W. 8th St.
- Tulsa, OK 74119 (918) 585-2986
- www.nrcys.ou.edu/default.htm

32 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Positive Adolescent Choices Training (PACT): secondary high-risk Afro-Americans--conduct problems & victims
- Betty R. Yung, Director
- Center for Adolescent Violence Prevention
- Wright State U./Ellis Human Devept. Inst.
- 9 N. Edwin C. Moses Blvd.
- Dayton, OH 45407 (937) 775-4300
- E-mail: byung@desire.wright.edu

33 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS): grades K-5--peer aggression
- Developmental Research & Programs
- 800-736-2630 www.drp.org/paths.html
- E-mail DrpMman@aol.com
- Mark Greenberg, Henderson Building South
- Penn State U.
- University Park, PA 16802

34 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Peace Builders: K-5-multicultural, prosocial changes school setting causes of aggression
- Jane Gulibon
- Heartsprings, Inc.
- P.O. Box 12158
- Tucson, AZ 85732 (800) 368-9356
- www.peacebuilders.com
- E-mail: custrel@heartsprings.org

35 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Second Step: PreK-Middle & 6-week parent education component-impulse control & anger management; violence decreased
- Committee for Children
- 2203 Airport Way South, Suite 500
- Seattle, WA 98134 (800) 634-4449
- www.cfchildren.org

36 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- School Safety Program: high school-fused violence curriculum w/police--threats to teachers & students down
- Dennis Kenney, Director
- Police Executive Research Forum
- 1120 Connecticut Ave. NW, Suite 930
- Washington, D.C. 20036 (202) 466-7820
- E-mail: dkenney@intr.net

37 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Bully Proofing Your School: elementary-- infused curriculum for anger control, empathy & shifting power away from bully
- Carla Garrity
- The Bully Project
- 5290 E. Yale Circle, Suite 207
- Denver, CO 80222
- (303) 649-8496

38 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- The Bullying Prevention Project: K-8- helps staff & parents intervene between bullies & their victims w/social cognitive theory
- Susan P. Limber, Director
- Bullying Prevention Project
- Institute For Families In Society
- U. of South Carolina (803) 737-3186
- Carolina Plaza, Columbia, SC 29208

39 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Transition intervention Program (TIP): 1-6- eliminates problem behavior & enhances academics. 9-wk. Curriculum w/ parents
- Sheral Schowe

- Transition Intervention Program
- 11454 High Mountain Drive
- Sandy, UT 84092
- (801) 964-7695

40 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Families & Schools together (FAST): ages 3-14-builds resilience, brings families into group clusters for support
- Lynn McDonald FAST Project E-mail: mrmcdona@facstaff.wisc.edu
- U. of Wisconsin-Madison (608) 263-9476
- 1025 W. Johnson St.
- Madison, WI 53706

41 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- First Step To Success: kindergarten w/ parents-decreases disruptive aggression for at-risk children
- Sopris West
- 4093 Specialty Pl.
- Longmont, CO 80504 (800) 547-6747
- www.sopriswest.com

42 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Functional Family Therapy (FFT): K-12-- family-based intervention to reduce recidivism of disruptive disorders
- Center for the Study & Prevention of Violence--Institute of Behavioral Sciences
- U. of Colorado, Box 442
- Boulder, CO 80309-0442 (303) 492-8465
- E-mail: Shafer@psych.utah.edu

43 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Strengthening Families Program: ages 6-10- 14 wks. For drug-abusing urban parents & their children
- Connie Tait (801) 585-9201
- Dept. of Health Promotion & Education
- 300 S. 1850 East, Room 215
- U. of Utah
- Salt Lake City, UT 84112

44 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Alternatives To Gang Membership: middle school-discourages gang membership well;
- Human Services
- City of Paramount
- 16400 Colorado Ave
- Paramount, CA 90723
- (213) 220-2140

45 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Gang Risk Intervention Program (GRIP): secondary--15 of 58 counties in California- involves kids, teachers, parents & community organizations including police
- Chuck Nichols E-mail:cnichols@cde.ca.gov
- Safe Schools & Violence Prevention Office
- Dept. of Education, 560 J Street, Suite 260
- Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 323-1026

46 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Gang Resistance Education & Training (GREAT): K-12-9 wks w/law enforcement-lower rates of delinquency & gang members
- GREAT Branch (800) 726-7070
- P.O. Box 50418
- Washington, D.C. 20091
- great@atfhq.atf.treas.gov

47 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Community Organization United to Reduce the Area's Gang Environment (COURAGE) K-8: deters gang membership & drug use
- Mary Fowlie, Project COURAGE
- Riverside County Office of Education
- 3939 Thirteenth St.
- Riverside, CA 92502 (909) 369-7860

48 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety

- Anti-Bias Curriculum: ages 2-5-cultural difference & how to resist stereotyping
- National Ass'n for the Education of Young Children

- 1509 16th St NW.,
- Washington, D.C. 20036-1426
- (202) 232-8777
- www.naeyc.org/default.htm

49 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety

- Healing The Hate: secondary-ten units about violence & prejudice & hate crimes
- National Hate Crime Prevention Project
- Education Development Center, Inc.,
- 55 Chapel St.
- Newton, MA 02158-1060
- (800) 225-4276

50 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety

- Schoolwide Violence Prevention: middle-early prevention & intervention
- Kay Mehas, Principal
- Kennedy Middle School (541) 687-3241
- 2200 Bailey Hill Rd.
- Eugene, OR 97405
- E-mail: mehas@4j.lane.edu

51 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Responding in Peaceful & Positive Ways (RIPP): grade 6; multicultural, small-group problem solving, peer mediation
- Aleta Lynn Meyer
- Life Skills Center (888) 572-1572
- VCU
- 800 W. Franklin, P.O. Box 842018
- Richmond, VA 23284-2018

52 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety

- Resolving Conflict Creatively Program (RCCP): K-12; school-based, inter group conflict resolution; teachers, parents, peers
- RCCP National Center
- 40 Exchange Pl, Suite 1111
- New York, NY 10005
- (212) 509-0022
- E-mail: esrrccp@aol.com

53 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report on School Safety-1998

- Student Problem Identification & Resolution (SPIR): grades 1-12-violence over racial bias & other hate crimes
- U.S. Department of Justice
- Community Relations Service
- 600 E St. NW., Suite 2000
- Washington, D.C. 20530
- (202) 305-2935 www.usdoj.gov/crs

54 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Dating Violence Prevention Program: high schools; improved communication, victims of dating violence
- K.D. O'Leary
- Dept. of Psychology (516) 632-7852
- SUNY--Stony Brook
- Stony Brook, NY 11794-2500
- E-mail: doleary@psych1.psy.sunysb.edu

55 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Flirting Or Hurting: grades 6-12; reduces sexual harassment & sexual violence w/ assertive action, multicultural tolerance
- NEA Professional Library
- Distribution Center (800) 229-4200
- P.O. Box 2035
- Annapolis Junction, MD 20701-2035

56 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Safe Dates: grades 8-9; 10 sessions, play & poster contest, changing gender stereotypes
- Vangee Foshee (919) 966-6616
- Dept. of Health Behavior & Health Ed.
- School of Public Health
- U. North Carolina-Chapel Hill, Box 7400
- Chapel Hill, NC 27599
- E-mail: vfoshee@sph.unc.edu

57 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- All Stars: middle & high school; 22 sessions character development & correcting misperceptions about substance abuse

- Wm. B. Hansen (800) 826-4539
- Tanglewood Research
- P.O. Box 1772
- Clemmons, NC 27012
- E-mail: billhansen@tanglewood.net

58 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Coping Power Program: middle schools; prevent substance abuse; anger coping; 33 small group activities; 16 parental sessions;
- John E. Lochman, Saxon Chair Psychology
- U. of Alabama
- Tuskaloosa, AL 35487
- (205) 348-5083
- E-mail: jlochman@GP.AS.UA.EDU

59 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Life Skills Training (LST): grades 7-9; 30 total sessions for three grades, drug resistance, coping, assertiveness
- Gilbert J. Botvin (212) 746-1270
- Institute for Prevention Research
- Cornell University Medical Center
- 411 E. 69th St. Room KB 201
- NY, NY 10021 E-mail: ipr@mail.med.cornell.edu

60 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Midwestern Prevention Project--Project Star ages 10-15; 2-year social curriculum w/ mass media infusion & parental program
- Angela Lapin, Manager (323) 865-0325
- Center for Prevention Policy Research
- Department of Preventive Medicine/ USC
- 1441 E. Lake Ave., MS 44
- Los Angeles, CA 90033-0800

61 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Project ALERT: grades 6-8; 11 weekly lessons; resisting drug use w/ parental involvement (alcohol, marijuana & tobacco)
- Project ALERT

- 725 Figueroa St., Suite 1615
- Los Angeles, CA 90017-5416
- (800) 253-7810
- E-mail: alertplus@aol.com

62 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Project NORTHLAND: grades 6-8; 3-year alcohol prevention w/parental participation
- Hazelden Publishing
- P.O. Box 176
- Center City, MN 55012
- (800) 328-9000
- www.hazelden.org

63 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Alternative Education Program: grade 9; at-risk drop outs; extracurricular interventions;
- Margaret Walsh, Principal
- Minnie Howard School
- 3801 W. Braddock Rd.
- Alexandria, VA 22302
- (703) 824-6750

64 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Coca-Cola Valued Youth Program: middle & high; trained to tutor elementary kids in academics
- Linda Cantu, Manager
- Intercultural Development Research Ass'n
- 5835 Callaghan Rd., Suite 350
- San Antonio, TX 78228
- (210) 684-8180

65 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Help One Student To Succeed (HOSTS): grades 1-10; dropout prevention, improved reading skills, remediate w/adult volunteers;
- Bill Gibbons
- HOSTS

- 8000 NE Parkway Dr., Suite 201
- Vancouver, WA 98662-6459
- (800) 833-4678 www.tele port.com/-hosts

66 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Project Helping Hand: K-8; excessively truant are referred to center w/8 sessions of family counseling, home visits & follow-up;
- Atlantic County Division
- Intergenerational Services
- 101 S. Shore Rd.
- Northfield, NJ 08225
- (609) 645-5862

67 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Reconnecting Youth: grades 9-12; remediate poor achievement, multiple behavior problems, for credit in Texas
- Derek Richey (800) 733-6786
- Nat'l Education Service
- 1252 Loesch Rd.
- Bloomington, IN 47402-0008
- www.nes.org

68 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Stafford County Alternative Education Program: high schools; violent, weapon-carrying students; academic, counseling, family & transportation
- G.Scott Walker, Director
- Alternative Education/Stafford Cty. Schools
- 35 Potomac Creek Dr. #97
- Falmouth, VA 22405 (540) 659-9899

69 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- School Safety Focus: grades 5-8; bullying, character education, peer mediation, conflict resolution
- Dr. Jim Nolan, Principal
- McCormick Middle School
- 801 Carolina St.
- McCormick, SC 29835

- (864) 465-2243

70 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- School Safety Focus: grades 9-12; at-risk, infused curriculum; student led;
- Jeffrey Miller, Principal
- G.Holmes Braddock Sr. High School
- 3601 SW 147th Ave.
- Miami, FL 33185
- (305) 225-9729 ext. 213
- deps.dade.k12.fl.us.

71 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Constructive Discipline Model: grades 4-8; reduces violence & vandalism;
- Gus Frias
- Safe Schools Coordinator (562) 922-6391
- Los Angeles County Office Of Education
- 9300 Imperial Highway, #281
- Downey, CA 90242

72 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Peer Culture Development (PCD): middle & high school; for-credit for at-risk youth; reduces violence & vandalism
- Todd Hoover (847) 853-3320
- School of Education/ MC Campus
- Loyola University
- 1041 Ridge Road
- Wilmette, IL 60091

73 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Comprehensive Weapons Reduction Initiative: K-12; random searches w/ police
- Bibb County Campus Police
- 2444 Roff Ave.
- Macon, GA 31204
- (912) 746-6114

74 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED): K-12; violence control;
- National Crime Prevention Institute
- School of Justice Administration
- University of Louisville
- Louisville, KY 40292
- (502) 852-6987

75 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Self-Enhancement Program: ages 7-18; conflict resolution & anger management;
- Self Enhancement, Inc.
- 3920 N. Kerby Ave.
- Portland, OR 97227
- (503) 249-1712

76 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- School Resource Officers Program (SRO): K-12; integrates law enforcement
- Pam Riley, Director
- Center for Prevention of School Violence
- 20 Enterprise St., Suite 2
- Raleigh, NC 27607-7375
- (800) 299-6054

77 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- Straight Talk About Risks (STAR): preK-12 bilingual prevention of gun violence/media;
- Center To Prevent Handgun Violence
- 1225 Eye St. NW
- Suite 1100
- Washington, D.C. 20005
- (202) 289-7319

78 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- School Safety Focus: grades 10-12; interdiction, prevention, intervention
- Edward J. Swensen, Project Manager
- School Safety Services
- 135 Fourth St.
- Greenport, NY 11933

- (516) 477-0180
- E-mail: dsss@idaccess.net

79 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- School Safety Focus: pre-K-12; special needs academic & behavioral intervention;
- James W. Hoebbel, Superintendent
- Westerly School Department
- 44 Park Ave.
- Westerly, RI 02891
- (401) 596-0315

80 ☐ Promising Model Programs: Annual Report On School Safety-1998

- School Safety Focus: grades 7-8; violence prevention for minority students;
- Fay Day, Principal
- Roth Middle School
- 4535 Hoover Ave.
- Dayton, OH 45417
- (937) 268-6754